

SCOTT RANK OF POLISH METRIC SPACES

MICHAŁ DOUCHA

ABSTRACT. Following the work of Friedman, Koerwien, Nies and Schlicht we positively answer their question whether the Scott rank of Polish metric spaces is countable.

INTRODUCTION

The origins of infinitary logic go back to the 1960's when it emerged through the work of Carpi, Scott, Morley, Lopez-Escobar among others. Let us highlight here mainly the work of D.S. Scott on countable structures: *Let L be a countable language and M a countable L -structure. Then there is a sentence φ of the $L_{\omega_1, \omega}$ -logic such that $M \models \varphi$ and if N is another countable L -structure such that $N \models \varphi$, then $M \cong N$.*

Tightly connected is the notion of ‘Scott rank’ that will be defined below.

Recently, by Friedman, Korwien, Nies, Schlicht ([1]), the Scott analysis has been applied to the case of Polish metric spaces which despite being uncountable in general share some properties with countable structures. They proved there exist Polish metric spaces of arbitrarily high countable Scott rank. The following question from [1] remained open.

Question 0.1. *Is the Scott rank of any Polish metric countable?*

Here we answer the question in affirmative. In the following section we review all necessary notion from infinitary logic used in the paper. We refer to [3] for a general reference on this subject. Also, to [2] for the connections of the Scott rank and the Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé games.

1. PRELIMINARIES

Definition 1.1. Let L be a countable relational language. Let M be a structure of the language L . Let $(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ be a pair of (ordered) tuples of the same length from M . We write

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03C07, 03C75, 03E15.

Key words and phrases. Scott rank, Polish metric space, infinitary logic.

- (1) $\vec{a} \equiv_0 \vec{b}$ if there is a partial isomorphism which maps $\vec{a}$ onto $\vec{b}$
- (2) If α is a limit ordinal then we write $\vec{a} \equiv_\alpha \vec{b}$ if $\vec{a} \equiv_\beta \vec{b}$ for all $\beta < \alpha$.
- (3) Finally, if $\alpha = \beta + 1$, for some ordinal β , then we write $\vec{a} \equiv_\alpha \vec{b}$ if for every $x_a, x_b \in M$ there are elements $y_b, y_a \in M$ such that $\vec{a}x_a \equiv_\beta \vec{b}y_b$ and $\vec{a}y_a \equiv_\beta \vec{b}x_b$.

Now, for every such pair $(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ of tuples from M , define the Scott rank of $(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$, $\text{sr}((\vec{a}, \vec{b}))$, as -1 if $\vec{a} \equiv_\alpha \vec{b}$ for every ordinal α ; otherwise, we define it as $\inf\{\alpha : \vec{a} \not\equiv_\alpha \vec{b}\}$.

Finally, we define the Scott rank of M , $\text{sr}(M)$, as $\sup\{\text{sr}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) + 1 : (\vec{a}, \vec{b}) \text{ are tuples of the same arbitrarily large length from } M\}$.

The following fact is almost immediate from the definition.

Fact 1.2. *Let M be a structure in some countable language L . Then $\text{sr}(M) < |M|^+$.*

We shall use another definition of the Scott rank that will be used in our arguments. We start with recalling the definition of Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé game (of length α).

Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé game

Let again M be some structure of a countable language L , α some ordinal and let $(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ be a pair of tuples of the same length from M for which there exists a partial isomorphism of M mapping one to the other. At the first step Player I chooses an ordinal $\alpha_1 < \alpha$, the left or right side and an element from M denoted either as x_1^L (if Player I chose the left side) or x_1^R (if he chose the right side). Player II responds by playing an element of M denoted as x_1^R (if Player I played x_1^L) or x_1^L (if Player I played x_1^R). In the next round, Player I chooses an ordinal $\alpha_2 < \alpha_1$, again the left or right side and an element from M denoted either as x_2^L (if Player I chose the left side) or x_2^R (if he chose the right side). Player II responds by playing an element of M denoted as x_2^R (if Player I played x_2^L) or x_2^L (if Player I played x_2^R). They continue similarly until Player I plays 0 as an ordinal. Thus the game ends after finitely many (let us say n) rounds. Player II wins if there is a partial isomorphism of M mapping $\vec{a}x_1^L \dots x_n^L$ onto $\vec{b}x_1^R \dots x_n^R$. Otherwise, Player I wins.

Let us denote such a game as $\text{EF}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}, \alpha)$.

Moreover, by $\text{EF}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}, \infty)$ we denote the game which is played analogously with the exception that Player I does not choose an ordinal but

only plays a side and an element. The game ends after countably many steps in which Player I and II produce elements $(x_n^L)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(x_n^R)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and Player II wins if there is a partial isomorphism of M mapping $\vec{a}$ onto $\vec{b}$ and for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ mapping x_n^L to x_n^R . Otherwise, Player I wins.

The following fact is folklore and can be easily checked.

Fact 1.3. *Let M be as above and let $(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ be a pair of tuples of the same length from M . Let α be some ordinal. Then $\vec{a} \equiv_\alpha \vec{b}$ iff Player II has a winning strategy in $\text{EF}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}, \alpha)$. Moreover, if M is a countable structure then there is an automorphism of M mapping $\vec{a}$ onto $\vec{b}$ iff Player II has a winning strategy in $\text{EF}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}, \infty)$.*

In what follows, we shall consider metric spaces as relational structures. Recall that metric space (X, d) can be viewed as a structure in a countable relational language if we define binary relations d_q and d^q for every $q \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ and interpret $d_q(x, y)$ as $d(x, y) < q$ and $d^q(x, y)$ as $d(x, y) > q$.

If (X, d) is a Polish metric space then according to Fact 1.2 we have that $\text{sr}(X) < \mathfrak{c}^+$.

2. MAIN THEOREM

Theorem 2.1. *Let (X, d) be a Polish metric space. Then the Scott rank of X is countable.*

Proposition 2.2. *Let $(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ be a pair of tuples (of the same length) from X . Then the Scott rank of $(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ is countable.*

Proof. To simplify the notation we shall assume that the length of the tuples is 1, i.e. we have a pair of points (a, b) . Suppose that for every $\alpha < \omega_1$ we have $a \equiv_\alpha b$. We shall prove that then there is an isometry of X which maps a to b . This will imply that $a \equiv_\alpha b$ for every α .

For every $\alpha < \omega_1$ let ϕ_α be the corresponding winning strategy for Player II in the game $\text{EF}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}, \alpha)$. We shall construct a countable almost-isometry whose domain and range both contain the dense subset $\{d_1, d_2, \dots\}$ of X .

Let $N_1 \subseteq \omega_1$ be an arbitrary uncountable non-stationary subset of ω_1 and let $F_1 : N_1 \rightarrow \omega_1$ be some regressive non-decreasing function such that preimages of singletons are bounded; in particular, $F_1[N_1]$, the image of N_1 under F_1 , is uncountable.

Now, for each $\alpha \in N_1$ consider the response of the strategy ϕ_α when Player I plays $(F_1(\alpha), L, d_1)$. Denote such response as y_α^1 . Since $F_1[N_1]$ is uncountable and X is separable there exists an uncountable subset

$M'_1 \subseteq N_1$ such that $\forall \alpha, \beta \in M'_1 (d(y_\alpha^1, y_\beta^1) < 1/2)$. Let y^1 be an arbitrary element of the set $\{y_\alpha^1 : \alpha \in M'_1\}$. Shrink M'_1 , if necessary, to an uncountable subset $M_1 \subseteq M'_1$ so that $F_1[M_1]$ is non-stationary. Let $G_1 : F_1[M_1] \rightarrow \omega_1$ be some regressive non-decreasing function with bounded preimages of singletons.

Again, for each $\alpha \in M_1$ consider the response of the strategy ϕ_α when Player I plays $(F_1(\alpha), L, d_1)$ in the first round and then $(G_1 \circ F_1(\alpha), R, d_1)$ in the second round. Denote such response as x_α^1 . Analogously as above, since $G_1 \circ F_1[M_1]$ is uncountable and X is separable there exists an uncountable subset $N'_2 \subseteq M_1$ such that $\forall \alpha, \beta \in N'_2 (d(x_\alpha^1, x_\beta^1) < 1/2)$. Let x^1 be an arbitrary element of the set $\{x_\alpha^1 : \alpha \in N'_2\}$. Shrink N'_2 , if necessary, to an uncountable subset $N_2 \subseteq N'_2$ so that $G_1 \circ F_1[N_2]$ is non-stationary. Let $F_2 : G_1 \circ F_1[N_2] \rightarrow \omega_1$ be some regressive non-decreasing function with bounded preimages of singletons.

Now suppose that we have already found $y^1, x^1, \dots, y^{n-1}, x^{n-1}$, uncountable sets $N_1 \supseteq M_1 \supseteq \dots M_{n-1} \supseteq N_n$ and regressive non-decreasing functions with bounded preimages of singletons $F_1, G_1, \dots, G_{n-1}, F_n$ such that for every $i \leq n-1$ both $F_i \circ \dots \circ F_1[M_i]$ and $G_i \circ F_i \circ \dots \circ F_1[N_{i+1}]$ are uncountable non-stationary. For each $\alpha \in N_n$ consider the response of the strategy ϕ_α when Player I plays $(F_1(\alpha), L, d_1)$ in the first round, $(G_1 \circ F_1(\alpha), R, d_1)$ in the second round, so on, and finally plays $(F_n \circ G_{n-1} \circ \dots \circ F_1(\alpha), L, d_n)$. Denote such response as y_α^n . As above, since $F_n \circ G_{n-1} \circ \dots \circ F_1[N_n]$ is uncountable and X is separable there exists an uncountable subset $M'_n \subseteq N_n$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in M'_n (d(y_\alpha^n, y_\beta^n) < 1/2^n)$$

Let y^n be an arbitrary element of the set $\{y_\alpha^n : \alpha \in M'_n\}$. Shrink M'_n , if necessary, to an uncountable subset $M_n \subseteq M'_n$ so that $F_n \circ \dots \circ F_1[M_n]$ is non-stationary. Let $G_n : F_n \circ \dots \circ F_1[M_n] \rightarrow \omega_1$ be some regressive non-decreasing function with bounded preimages of singletons.

The next step is predictable, let us state it anyway. For each $\alpha \in M_n$ consider the response of the strategy ϕ_α when Player I plays $(F_1(\alpha), L, d_1)$ in the first round, $(G_1 \circ F_1(\alpha), R, d_1)$ in the second round, so on, and finally plays $(F_n \circ G_{n-1} \circ \dots \circ F_1(\alpha), L, d_n)$ in the $2n-1$ -st round and then $(G_n \circ F_n \circ \dots \circ F_1(\alpha), R, d_n)$ in the $2n$ -th round. Denote such response as x_α^n . Since $G_n \circ \dots \circ F_1[M_n]$ is uncountable and X is separable there exists an uncountable subset $N'_{n+1} \subseteq M_n$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad \forall \alpha, \beta \in N'_{n+1} (d(x_\alpha^n, x_\beta^n) < 1/2^n)$$

Let x^n be an arbitrary element of the set $\{x_\alpha^n : \alpha \in N'_{n+1}\}$. Shrink N'_{n+1} , if necessary, to an uncountable subset $N_{n+1} \subseteq N'_{n+1}$ so that $G_n \circ \dots \circ$

$F_1[N_{n+1}]$ is non-stationary. Finally, let $F_{n+1} : G_n \circ \dots \circ F_1[N_{n+1}] \rightarrow \omega_1$ be some regressive non-decreasing function with bounded preimages of singletons.

This finishes the inductive construction.

After the construction is done, let us consider the function $\psi : \{d_1, d_2, \dots\} \cup \{x^1, x^2, \dots\} \rightarrow \{d_1, d_2, \dots\} \cup \{y^1, y^2, \dots\}$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\psi(d_n) = y^n$ and $\psi(x^n) = d_n$.

Claim 2.3. *For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ let z^i be either d_i or x^i . Then for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $|d(z^i, z^j) - d(\psi(z^i), \psi(z^j))| < 1/2^i + 1/2^j$ and $|d(a, z^j) - d(b, \psi(z^j))| < 1/2^j$.*

Proof of the claim. Suppose $i < j$. Let us also suppose that $z^i = d_i$ and $z^j = d_j$, the other cases are completely analogous. Let $\alpha \in M_j$ be arbitrary. By 2.1 (and definition of y^n below 2.1) we have

$$d(y^j = \psi(d_j), y_\alpha^j) < 1/2^j$$

and

$$d(y^i = \psi(d_i), y_\alpha^i) < 1/2^i$$

Since ϕ_α is a winning strategy, by definition we must have

$$d(z^i, z^j) = d(y_\alpha^i, y_\alpha^j)$$

Thus putting the (in)equalities above together we get

$$|d(z^i, z^j) - d(\psi(z^i), \psi(z^j))| < 1/2^i + 1/2^j$$

Similarly, since ϕ_α is a winning strategy, by definition we must have

$$d(a, z^j) = d(b, y_\alpha^j)$$

and the inequality

$$|d(a, z^j) - d(b, \psi(z^j))| < 1/2^j$$

again follows.

□ (of the claim)

We now define the autoisometry $\chi : X \rightarrow X$ taking a to b . For any $x \in X$ choose arbitrarily some Cauchy sequence $(d_n^x)_n$ from $\{d_1, d_2, \dots\}$ converging to x . It follows from Claim 2.3 that $(\psi(d_n^x))_n$ is Cauchy as well and we set $\chi(x)$ as the limit of this sequence. It also follows from Claim 2.3 that χ is correctly defined, i.e. it does not matter which Cauchy sequence converging to x we choose, that $\chi(a) = b$, and finally that χ is an autoisometry of X . This finishes the proof. □

It follows from Proposition 2.2 that $\text{sr}(X) \leq \omega_1$. If it were greater than ω_1 there would have to be a pair of tuples $(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ of the same length from X such that $\text{sr}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) \geq \omega_1$ which would contradict the proposition.

Thus we must rule out the possibility that $\text{sr}(X) = \omega_1$. Assume that it is the case. Then there exists a cofinal subset $A \subseteq \omega_1$ of countable ordinals such that for every $\alpha \in A$ there is a pair of tuples of the same length $(\vec{a}_\alpha, \vec{b}_\alpha)$ from M such that $\vec{a}_\alpha \equiv_\alpha \vec{b}_\alpha$, however $\vec{a}_\alpha \not\equiv_{\alpha+1} \vec{b}_\alpha$. WLOG we may suppose that the length of $\vec{a}_\alpha$ and $\vec{b}_\alpha$ is the same, say n , for all $\alpha \in A$. We reach the contradiction by applying the following proposition.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $A \subseteq \omega_1$ be a cofinal subset of countable ordinals and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $((\vec{a}_\alpha, \vec{b}_\alpha))_{\alpha \in A}$ be an A -indexed family of pair of tuples, all of the length n , such that $\forall \alpha \in A$ we have $\vec{a}_\alpha \equiv_\alpha \vec{b}_\alpha$. Then there exists an uncountable subset $B \subseteq A$ such that for every pair $(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ such that $(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ lies in the closure of $\{(\vec{a}_\alpha, \vec{b}_\alpha) : \alpha \in B\} \subseteq X^{2n}$, i.e. considering the pair $(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ as an element of X^{2n} , there exists an autoisometry of X mapping $\vec{a}$ onto $\vec{b}$.*

Observe that once the proposition is proved, we are done. Indeed, apply the previous proposition to the set A above to get the set B . Then for every $\alpha \in B$ the pair $(\vec{a}_\alpha, \vec{b}_\alpha)$ obviously lies in the closure of $\{(\vec{a}_\alpha, \vec{b}_\alpha) : \alpha \in B\} \subseteq X^{2n}$, thus according to the proposition there exists an autoisometry of X mapping $\vec{a}_\alpha$ onto $\vec{b}_\alpha$. That is, however, in contradiction with the assumption that $\vec{a}_\alpha \not\equiv_{\alpha+1} \vec{b}_\alpha$.

Thus it remains to prove Proposition 2.4.

Proof of Proposition 2.4. For any subset $C \subseteq A$ by X_C we shall denote the set $\{(\vec{a}_\alpha, \vec{b}_\alpha) : \alpha \in C\}$. Let $B \subseteq A$ be an uncountable subset such that for every basic open set $O \subseteq X^{2n}$ the intersection $X_B \cap O$ is either uncountable or empty.

Let F be the closed set that is a complement of the following open set: $\bigcup\{O : O \text{ is basic open and } O \cap X_B = \emptyset\}$. By assumption, X_B is ω_1 -dense in F . We need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *The set $I = \{(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) \in F : \text{sr}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = -1\}$ is $\mathfrak{c}$ -dense in F , i.e. for every basic open set O such that $O \cap F \neq \emptyset$ we have $|O \cap I| = \mathfrak{c}$.*

Recall that $\text{sr}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = -1$ means there exists an autoisometry of X that maps $\vec{a}$ onto $\vec{b}$.

The following lemma will then finish the job.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $G \subseteq X^{2n}$ be a closed set such that the set $I_G = \{(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) \in G : \text{sr}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = -1\}$ is ω_1 -dense in G . Then in fact $G = I_G$.*

Proof of Lemma 2.5. Take an arbitrary basic open O such that $O \cap F \neq \emptyset$. Let $C \subseteq B$ be the uncountable subset of ordinals such that $X_C = X_B \cap O$. For each $\alpha \in C$ let ϕ_α be the winning strategy for Player II in the game $\text{EF}(\vec{a}_\alpha, \vec{b}_\alpha, \alpha)$.

The argument will use the same ideas as in the proof of Proposition 2.2 thus we will omit some details. Consider two disjoint uncountable non-stationary subsets C_0 and C_1 of C such that $\text{diam}(X_{C_i}) < 1$, for $i \in \{0, 1\}$, and $\overline{X_{C_0}} \cap \overline{X_{C_1}} = \emptyset$ (where we consider the diameter in some compatible metric, let us say the sum metric on X^{2n} , and $\overline{X_{C_i}}$ denotes the closure of X_{C_i}). Let $F_i : C_i \rightarrow \omega_1$, for $i \in \{0, 1\}$, be some regressive non-decreasing function with preimages of singletons bounded.

Now, for each $\alpha \in C_i$, $i \in \{0, 1\}$, consider the response of the strategy ϕ_α when Player I plays $(F_i(\alpha), L, d_1)$. Denote such response as y_α^i . Since $F_i[C_i]$ is uncountable and X^{2n} is separable there exists an uncountable subset $D_i \subseteq C_i$ such that $\forall \alpha, \beta \in D_i (d(y_\alpha^i, y_\beta^i) < 1)$. Let y^i be an arbitrary element of the set $\{y_\alpha^i : \alpha \in D_i\}$.

Now consider two disjoint uncountable subsets C_{i0} and C_{i1} of D_i , again $i \in \{0, 1\}$, such that $F_i[C_{ij}]$ is non-stationary, $\text{diam}(X_{C_{ij}}) < 1/2$, for $j \in \{0, 1\}$, and $\overline{X_{C_{i0}}} \cap \overline{X_{C_{i1}}} = \emptyset$. Let $F_{ij} : C_{ij} \rightarrow \omega_1$ be some regressive non-decreasing function with preimages of singletons bounded.

For $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$ and for each $\alpha \in C_{ij}$ consider the response of the strategy ϕ_α when Player I plays $(F_i(\alpha), L, d_1)$ in the first round and then $(F_{ij} \circ F_i(\alpha), R, d_1)$ in the second round. Denote such response as x_α^{ij} . Analogously as above, since $F_{ij} \circ F_i[C_{ij}]$ is uncountable and X^{2n} is separable there exists an uncountable subset $D_{ij} \subseteq C_{ij}$ such that $\forall \alpha, \beta \in D_{ij} (d(x_\alpha^{ij}, x_\beta^{ij}) < 1/2)$. Let x^{ij} be an arbitrary element of the set $\{x_\alpha^{ij} : \alpha \in D_{ij}\}$. We then again find two disjoint uncountable subsets C_{ij0} and C_{ij1} of D_{ij} , $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$, such that $F_{ij} \circ F_i[C_{ijk}]$ is non-stationary, $\text{diam}(X_{C_{ijk}}) < 1/4$, for $k \in \{0, 1\}$, and $\overline{X_{C_{ij0}}} \cap \overline{X_{C_{ij1}}} = \emptyset$. Let $F_{ijk} : C_{ijk} \rightarrow \omega_1$ be some regressive non-decreasing function with preimages of singletons bounded.

Following this scheme and using the same ideas as in the proof Proposition 2.2 we produce the Cantor scheme $(C_s)_{s \in 2^{<\omega}}$ such that for each $r \in 2^\omega$ we have that $\bigcap_n \overline{X_{C_{r|n}}}$ is a single pair of tuples $(\vec{a}_r, \vec{b}_r) \in F$ and there is a function $\psi_r : \{d_1, d_2, \dots\} \cup \{x^{r|2}, x^{r|4}, \dots\} \rightarrow \{d_1, d_2, \dots\} \cup$

$\{y^{r \upharpoonright 1}, y^{r \upharpoonright 3}, \dots\}$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\psi_r(d_n) = y^{r \upharpoonright 2n-1}$ and $\psi_r(x^{r \upharpoonright 2n}) = d_n$.

The following claim is analogous to Claim 2.3.

Claim 2.7. *Let $r \in 2^\omega$ be arbitrary. For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$ let z^i be either d_i or $x^{r \upharpoonright 2i}$. Then for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $|d(z^i, z^j) - d(\psi_r(z^i), \psi_r(z^j))| < 1/2^i + 1/2^j$ and for every $m < |\vec{a}_r|$ we have $|d(\vec{a}_r(m), z^j) - d(\vec{b}_r(m), \psi(z^j))| < 1/2^{j-2}$.*

Proof of the claim. The proof of the first part, i.e.

$$|d(z^i, z^j) - d(\psi_r(z^i), \psi_r(z^j))| < 1/2^i + 1/2^j$$

is completely analogous to the proof of the corresponding part in Claim 2.3.

Let us prove the second part. Suppose that $z^j = d_j$, the other case is similar. Let $\alpha \in C_{r \upharpoonright 2j-1}$ be arbitrary. By assumption we have

$$d(y^{r \upharpoonright 2j-1} = \psi_r(d_j), y_\alpha^{r \upharpoonright 2j-1}) < 1/2^j$$

Moreover, we have

$$d(\vec{a}_\alpha(m), \vec{a}_r(m)) < 1/(m \cdot 2^j) \leq 1/2^j$$

and

$$d(\vec{b}_\alpha(m), \vec{b}_r(m)) < 1/(m \cdot 2^j) \leq 1/2^j$$

Since ϕ_α is a winning strategy for Player II, we have

$$d(y_\alpha^{r \upharpoonright 2j-1}, \vec{b}_\alpha(m)) = d(d_j, \vec{a}_\alpha(m))$$

Putting the (in)equalities above together we get the desired

$$|d(\vec{a}_r(m), z^j) - d(\vec{b}_r(m), \psi(z^j))| < 1/2^{j-2}$$

□ (of the claim)

As in the proof of Proposition 2.2, for every $r \in 2^\omega$ using ψ_r and its properties guaranteed by Claim 2.7 we define the autoisometry $\chi_r : X \rightarrow X$ that maps $\vec{a}_r$ onto $\vec{b}_r$ and we are done.

□ (of Lemma 2.5)

It remains to prove Lemma 2.6. The proof is again a variation on the same ideas as in the proofs above so we shall omit some details.

Proof of Lemma 2.6. Let R be the index set for the set $I_G = \{(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) \in G : \text{sr}(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = -1\}$, i.e. $I_G = \{(\vec{a}_r, \vec{b}_r) : r \in R\}$ and we shall adopt a notation used above so that for any $P \subseteq R$ the symbol X_P shall denote

the set $\{(\vec{a}_r, \vec{b}_r) : r \in P\}$. Moreover, for every $r \in R$ let us denote ϕ_r the winning strategy for Player II in the game $\text{EF}(\vec{a}_r, \vec{b}_r, \infty)$.

Let us divide R into (not necessarily disjoint) countably many uncountable sets $R_1, R_2, \dots$ such that for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\text{diam}(X_{R_m}) < 1/2$ and for every basic open O we still have that either $O \cap X_{R_m} = \emptyset$ or $O \cap X_{R_m}$ is uncountable. Now for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \in R_m$, consider the response of the strategy ϕ_r when Player I plays (L, d_1) . Denote such response as y_r^1 . Since R_m is uncountable and X^{2n} is separable we can divide R_m into (not necessarily disjoint) countably many uncountable sets $R_{m1}, R_{m2}, \dots$ such that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\text{diam}(\{y_r^1 : r \in R_{mi}\}) < 1/2$. Moreover, we may suppose that for every basic open set O the intersection $O \cap X_{R_{mi}}$ is either empty or uncountable (if not, we throw away at most countably many elements from R_{mi} so that the assertion holds). Let y^{mi} be an arbitrary element of the set $\{y_r^1 : r \in R_{mi}\}$.

Next, for each $m, i \in \mathbb{N}$ split R_{mi} into not necessarily disjoint countably many uncountable sets $R_{mi1}, R_{mi2}, \dots$ such that for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\text{diam}(X_{R_{mij}}) < 1/4$ and for every basic open O we still have that either $O \cap X_{R_{mij}} = \emptyset$ or $O \cap X_{R_{mij}}$ is uncountable. Now for each m, i, j and $r \in R_{mij}$ consider the response of the strategy ϕ_r when Player I plays (L, d_1) in the first round and then (R, d_1) in the second round. Denote such response as x_r^1 . Since R_{mij} is uncountable and X^{2n} is separable we can divide R_{mij} into (not necessarily disjoint) countably many uncountable sets $R_{mij1}, R_{mij2}, \dots$ such that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\text{diam}(\{x_r^1 : r \in R_{mijk}\}) < 1/2$. Let x^{mijk} be an arbitrary element of the set $\{x_r^1 : r \in R_{mijk}\}$.

Following this scheme and using the same ideas as in the proofs of Proposition 2.2 and Lemma 2.5 we produce the $\mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}$ -indexed collection $(R_s)_{s \in \mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}}$ such that for every $s \in \mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}$ and basic open O we have that $O \cap X_{R_s}$ is either empty or uncountable, and for each $v \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ we have that $\bigcap_n \overline{X_{R_{v|n}}}$ is a single pair of tuples $(\vec{a}_v, \vec{b}_v) \in F$ and there is a function $\psi_v : \{d_1, d_2, \dots\} \cup \{x^{v|4}, x^{v|8}, \dots\} \rightarrow \{d_1, d_2, \dots\} \cup \{y^{v|2}, y^{v|6}, \dots\}$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\psi_v(d_n) = y^{v|(4n-2)}$ and $\psi_v(x^{v|(4n)}) = d_n$.

As before, one can check that each ψ_v determines an autoisometry $\chi_v : X \rightarrow X$ mapping $\vec{a}_v$ onto $\vec{b}_v$.

So it remains to check that for every $(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) \in G$ there exists $v \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $(\vec{a}, \vec{b}) = (\vec{a}_v, \vec{b}_v)$. However, this follows from the following fact: $G = \bigcup_n \overline{X_{R_n}}$ and for every $s \in \mathbb{N}^{<\mathbb{N}}$ we have $\overline{X_{R_s}} = \bigcup_n \overline{X_{R_{sn}}}$.

This finishes the proof of Lemma 2.6, thus also of Proposition 2.4 and the main theorem. $\square$

3. PROBLEMS

The main problem left is to determine the connection between the Scott rank of a countable metric space and its completion.

The following theorem has been proved by Philipp Schlicht.

Theorem 3.1 (P. Schlicht). *There is a countable ultrahomogeneous metric space whose completion is not ultrahomogeneous.*

Recall that a metric space X is ultrahomogeneous if any finite partial isometry between two subspaces of X extends to an isometry of X ; one can easily check this is equivalent with having the Scott rank 0.

However, it is still unclear whether the rank can increase arbitrarily after the completion or there is some bound. Note that the latter case would give another proof that the Scott rank of a Polish metric space is countable (assuming the bound is reasonable).

On the other hand, it is a trivial observation that the Scott rank can decrease after the completion. Just consider any non-ultrahomogeneous countable dense subset of an ultrahomogeneous Polish metric space.

Let us summarize the problems in the form of questions below. The case of countable ultrahomogeneous metric spaces is especially interesting so let us start with them.

Question 3.2. *Does there exist for every countable ordinal α an ultrahomogeneous countable metric space X_α such that $\text{sr}(\overline{X}_\alpha) \geq \alpha$?*

The main question to be answered (and especially if the answer to the previous one is negative) is the following.

Question 3.3. *Does there exist a countable ordinal α such that for any countable metric space X we have $\text{sr}(\overline{X}) \leq \text{sr}(X) + \alpha$?*

Acknowledgment. The author would like to thank to Matatyahu Rubin and Philipp Schlicht for introducing him into the subject and very fruitful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Friedman, M. Koerwien, A. Nies, P. Schlicht, *Scott analysis of Polish spaces*, preprint
- [2] W. Hodges, *Model theory. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*, 42, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993

- [3] H. J. Keisler, *Model Theory for Infinitary Logic: Logic with Countable Conjunctions and Finite Quantifiers*, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, Vol. 62. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-London, 1971. x+208

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, WARSAW,
POLAND

E-mail address: `m.doucha@post.cz`